THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE N.V.RAMANA

Writ Petition No.27897 of 2005

Dated:6th June, 2006

Between:

M.V.S.Reddy, E-108831, Conductor,

Mammalamadugu Depot, age 45 years,

R/o. Mammalamadugu, Kadapa District.

…..PETITIONER

AND

The A.P.S.R.T.C,

rep by its Regional Managaer,

Kadapa Region at Kadapa &

2 others.

….RESPONDENTS

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE

N.V.RAMANA

W.P.No.27897 of 2005

-

ORDER:

This writ petition is filed assailing the proceedings of the 3rd respondent-Depot Manager, A.P.S.R.T.C, Jammalamadugu Depot, in proceedings No.02/95 (16)/94-Proddutur, dated 18-5-1994 by which the petitioner who is a Conductor was imposed a major punishment of deferment of annual increment for a period of three years with cumulative effect, without conducting any enquiry.

The operative portion of the impugned order of the respondent reads thus:

> *"I, therefore, hereby order that your annual increment which next falls due be with held for a period of THREE YEARS which shall have the effect of postponing future increments.""*

It is the case of the petitioner that he is working as Conductor at respondent-Depot and the 3rd respondent issued a charge-sheet dated 5-2-1994 on the allegation that the petitioner has committed cash and ticket irregularities, for which the petitioner submitted explanation. It is the further case of the petitioner that proceedings of the 3rd respondent-Depot Manager, A.P.S.R.T.C, Jammalamadugu Depot, in proceedings No.02/95 (16)/94-Proddutur, dated 18-5-1994 imposing punishment of deferment of increment for a period three years with cumulative effect is a major punishment and cannot be imposed without conducting departmental enquiry and such imposition is contrary to law and contrary to the Judgment of the Supreme court in ***Kulwanth Singh Gill v. State of Punjab ,*** and due to such major punishment the petitioner is facing much financial problems as he is drawing less salary.

Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and perused the impugned order as well as the Judgment of this Court in W.P.No.23114 of 2005, dated 27-10-2005.

Admittedly, the respondent without conducting departmental enquiry imposed the penalty of stoppage of increment for a period of three years, with cumulative effect on the basis of the charges leveled against the petitioner which is a major penalty as is held by this Court in a similar matter in W.P.No.23114 of 2005, dated 27-10-2005 following the Judgment of the Supreme Court in ***Kulwanth Singh Gill v. State of Punjab.*** The operative portion of the judgment in W.P.No.23114 of 2005, dated 27-10-2005 reads thus:

> *"In the ordinary course of things, the impugned order needs to be set aside, leaving it open to the respondent to pass fresh orders. To avoid further delay and complication in the matter, this court is of the view that the*

impugned order can be treated, as the one for stoppage of annual increment, without cumulative effect.

Hence, the writ petition is partly allowed, directing that the order dated 16-11-1993, passed by the respondent, shall be treated as the one for stoppage of annual increment, for a period of six months, without cumulative effect, and that the petitioner shall not be entitled for any monetary benefits up to the date of this order. There shall be no order as to costs."

In the above view of the matter, this writ petition is disposed of in terms of the judgment of this Court in W.P.No.23114 of 2005, dated 27-10-2005 directing the respondents as under.

The respondent is directed to treat the impugned order in proceedings No.02/95 (16)/94-Proddutur, dated 18-5-1974 as the one for stoppage of increment, for a period of three years without cumulative effect, and that the petitioner shall not be entitled for any monetary benefits up to the date of this order. No costs.

_____

(N.V. RAMANA, J.)

Date:6th June, 2006.

GRK